

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrod et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,049) in view of Clapper (US 2002/0167916). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Herrod and Clapper teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1-3 and 5-20.

Claims 1 and 20 claim, *inter alia*, “determining a position and an orientation in the three dimensional space of the portable display device in relation to the local reference frame; and providing the product information via the portable display device according to the position and orientation of the portable display device in the three dimensional space.” Claim 15 claims, *inter alia*, “a correlation means for determining the object according to a known position of the object within the three dimensional space, and a position and an orientation of the portable display device within the three dimensional space; and a database for providing, via the portable display device, information corresponding to the object.”

Herrod teaches a terminal and access point for transmitting information concerning products available in the locality of the terminal for display (see col. 10, lines 36-44). Herrod does not teach or suggest a system for “providing the product information via the portable display device according to the position and orientation of the portable display device in the three dimensional space” as claimed in claims 1 and 20, nor, “a correlation means for determining the object according to a known position of the object within the three dimensional space, and a position and an orientation of the portable display device within the three

dimensional space” as claimed in claim 15. Herrod teaches determining a location of a user with respect to a nearest access point (see col. 10, lines 37-40). Herrod teaches a simple positioning system for determining the location in two dimensions, i.e., a location on a map. Herrod does not teach or suggest determining a position in three dimensional space. Therefore Herrod fails to teach all the limitations of claims 1, 20 and 15.

Clapper teaches obtaining a user’s location (see paragraph [0030]). Clapper does not teach or suggest a system for “providing the product information via the portable display device according to the position and orientation of the portable display device in the three dimensional space” as claimed in claims 1 and 20, nor, “a correlation means for determining the object according to a known position of the object within the three dimensional space, and a position and an orientation of the portable display device within the three dimensional space” as claimed in claim 15. Clapper teaches a system for obtaining a location of a user, and more particularly of a shopping cart to which a PDA is attached (see paragraphs [0040]). Similar to Herrod, Clapper’s teaching of location is confined to two-dimensions, i.e., a location on a map (see paragraph [0030]). Clapper does not teach or suggest determining a position in three dimensional space, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 20 and 15. Therefore, Clapper fails to cure the deficiencies of Herrod.

The combined teachings of Herrod and Clapper teach obtaining a location of a device in two dimensions. The combined teachings of Herrod and Clapper fail to teach or suggest “providing the product information via the portable display device according to the position and orientation of the portable display device in the three dimensional space” as claimed in claims 1 and 20, nor, “a correlation means for determining the object according to a known position of the

object within the three dimensional space, and a position and an orientation of the portable display device within the three dimensional space” as claimed in claim 15.

Claims 2, 3 and 5-14 depend from claim 1. Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 15. At least claims 9 and 18 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 9 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, that a device “orientation is determined in three rotation angles.”

Herrod teaches that a first function may be performed by a device in a first orientation, and a second function may be performed by the device in a second orientation, i.e., activated in a first orientation and deactivated in a second orientation (see col. 17, lines 2-14). Nowhere does Herrod teach the orientation is determined in three rotation angles, essentially as claimed in claims 9 and 18. Herrod merely teaches a method for turning a terminal on and off according to whether the terminal is in a first orientation or in a second orientation. Further, a review of U.S. Patent Application Ser. No. 08/614,068, upon which Herrod relies reveals that orientation is determined only with respect to time and not to space, that is, Herrod teaches a mere motion detector; “a portable terminal has a housing with a motion detector housed therein. Movement of the housing from a rest position is detected by sensing the motion of a coil or magnet located within the housing” (see Abstract of 08/614,068). A motion detector does not determine orientation in three rotation angles. A motion detector merely detects a change in orientation over time. Thus, Herrod does not teach or suggest that “orientation is determined in three rotation angles” as claimed in claims 9 and 18. Therefore, Herrod fails to teach all the limitations of claims 9 and 18.

Clapper teaches obtaining a user's location (see paragraph [0030]). Clapper does not teach or suggest that "orientation is determined in three rotation angles" as claimed in claims 9 and 18. Clapper teaches a system for obtaining a location of a user, and more particularly of a shopping cart to which a PDA is attached (see paragraphs [0040]). Nowhere does Clapper teach or suggest determining an orientation, much less that orientation is determined in three rotation angles, essentially as claimed in claims 9 and 18. Therefore, Clapper fails to cure the deficiencies of Herrod.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrod in view of Clapper, and further in view of Stevens (US 2002/0087392). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Herrod, Clapper and Stevens teach or suggests all the limitations of claim 4.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Claim 4 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-20, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889